2:Newcomb E-4, 5 (1951-1952) 1956
NM7 Delaware NM7

423
[114]

R. H. Lowie[109] and others who at this time (*ca.* 1920) were attempting to demonstrate that private ownership was the rule and not the exception in primitive society. I do not deny that the Delawares shared in the Eastern Algonkian trait of family-held hunting grounds. I do deny, however, that the early historic concept of land ownership was analogous to the European one. Wallace, who has made the most penetrating study of early Delaware land tenure, summed up their concept by saying:

> To the Delaware Indian, land was an element, a medium of existence, like the air and the sunlight and the rivers. To him, "ownership" of land meant, not exclusive personal title to the soil itself, but occupation of a certain position of responsibility in the social unit which exploited the soil. The "sale" of land (to use the white man's term) might, to the Delaware, be almost any mutually satisfactory change in the relationship of two groups of persons subsisting on the land. In the earliest sales, the Indians seem to have intended only to give the whites freedom to use the land in conjunction with the native population.[109]

MacLeod in a footnote tacitly agreed with this point of view, saying: "The selling of land of course was a notion foreign, so far as we know, to native ideas or practice."[110]

There are no seventeenth-century sources which, to my knowledge, described directly and in straightforward fashion the hunting territories. On the basis of the records of early land transactions, however, both MacLeod and Wallace have reconstructed the system which must have existed. The smallest unit of land was a named "hunting territory covering up to two hundred square miles of land."[111] Their boundaries were often vague, and territories overlapped, although natural landmarks were used as boundaries. "Such territories are often associated in European documents with the names of individual Indians, who are called 'owners.'"[112] Most of these territories were, however, sold by groups of Indians. In short, the so-called "owners" were simply representatives of the social units who used this land.[113] It also appears that disposition of these territories did not rest solely in the hands of these individuals, but was the privilege of the community.[114] Wallace has demonstrated that a number of individual hunting territories made up a larger unit which he terms "communal territories" of "up to 1500 square miles."[115]

428
423

Inheritance of hunting territory right is but vaguely understood. MacLeod has suggested that the inheritance of hunting territory was through the paternal line, since it was used primarily by males. If this was true it would suggest either that matrilineal reckoning of kinship was a historic accretion to Delaware culture, or that the two systems existed side by side.[116] Wallace has concluded, as have I, that the maternal lineage was the social unit that "owned" or perhaps more aptly

[109] Lowie, 1920, pp. 210 ff.
[110] Wallace, 1947, p. 2; Heckewelder, 1881, p. 102, agreed with this concept of land possession.
[111] MacLeod, 1922, p. 463.
[112] Wallace, 1947, p. 3.
[113] *Ibid.*, p. 3; MacLeod, 1922, p. 463.
[114] Wallace, 1947, p. 4.
[115] *Ibid.*, p. 5.
[116] *Ibid.*, p. 6.
[117] MacLeod, 1922, p. 453.

2:Newcomb E-4,5 (1951-1952) 1956
NM7 Delaware NM7

428 "belonged to" the "individual" hunting territory.[117] The lineage, clan, 423 and phratry are discussed in the next chapter. There is nothing incompatible in the existence of maternal lineages (or clans) and male-used hunting territories.

Material Culture

361 Villages.— There is little information concerning the villages and 621 general settlement pattern of the early historic Delawares. Villages, or perhaps they might better be termed hamlets, were situated in bottom lands near the gardens or along the shores of bays.[118] These dispersed settlements were not palisaded.[119] Eighteenth-century and later information seems to reflect the original condition in that these settlements had no regular plan or arrangement, and that houses were not built close together.[120] There is no information concerning the length of time these villages were inhabited. If their garden plots were fertilized, residence in the villages may have been relatively permanent, but the fertilizer issue is in doubt. By the eighteenth century, after extensive migrations, villages were occupied until it became "troublesome to se- 364 cure wood for fuel" and, implicitly, until they became overburdened with filth.[121] The Evelin paper of 1648 described twenty-three communities in New Jersey, ranging in population from fourteen to six hundred persons.[122] Lindestrom noted community size as "several hundred men strong, under each chief, counting women and children, some being stronger, some weaker."[123]

342 Dwellings.— There seems to have been some diversity in the type of 171 dwellings of the early seventeenth-century Delawares. A circular wigwam and a long house identical with the Iroquoian type have been described, although the latter seems to represent a late prehistoric diffusion. De Laet and Van der Donck depicted Delawares using a circular bark dwelling with vaulted ceiling.[124] In another place De Laet stated that the dwelling was oven-shaped, but large enough for several related families.[125] Penn and Pastorius also alluded to this style of dwelling, whereas Holm and Lindestrom mentioned what seems to be the Iroquoian long house.[126] Zeisberger in the eighteenth century distinguished between house types of the Iroquois and the Delawares, describing a "rounded, arched roof" for the Iroqouis and a "high-pitched, peaked roof" for the Delawares.[127] Harrington in 1913 characterized the house type current a few years previously as being similar to the Iroquois type.[128] The evidence, then, is not conclusive, but it seems probable

[117] Wallace, 1947, p. 18.
[118] Zeisberger, 1910, p. 87; Wallace, 1947, p. 18.
[119] Lindestrom, 1925, p. 241.
[120] Zeisberger, 1910, p. 87; O. A., J. T.
[121] Zeisberger, 1910, p. 87.
[122] Smith, 1877, p. 11.
[123] Lindestrom, 1925, p. 170.
[124] De Laet, 1909, p. 57; Van der Donck, 1909, p. 302.
[125] De Laet, 1909, p. 57.
[126] Penn, 1912, p. 232; Pastorius, 1912, p. 425; Holm, 1834, p. 123; Lindestrom, 1925, p. 211.
[127] Zeisberger, 1910, pp. 17-18.
[128] Harrington, 1913, pp. 217-18.

3:Zeisberger M-5 (1767-1780)1910
NM7 Delaware NM7

often dyed red with cinnabar about the neck. Such a shirt may be worn unwashed until it is torn. More careful women, however wash their clothing. Men and women paint their faces almost daily, especially if they go out to a dance in the evening. Men, particularly, think it is proper to paint and often their whole head is colored vermillion.[255] Here and there black spots may be introduced, or they paint one-half of their head and face black, the other red. Figures are added according to taste.[256] Indian women never paint their faces with a variety of figures, but rather make a round red spot upon each cheek and redden the eyelids, the tops of their heads and, in some cases, the rims of the ears and the temples.[257] Older women adorn themselves but rarely, usually appearing in old cast-off garments. Even if the husband of such a woman provides new clothing, she will rarely put it on, especially if she has a daughter to whom she gives the new clothing in exchange for old garments.

Their towns are generally laid out near a lake, river or brook, yet sufficiently elevated to escape the danger of inundations, which are very common in spring. In building towns no regular plan is observed but every one builds according to his fancy. The houses are not built close together. Some years ago, when the Delawares planned Gochachgünk, they wished to imitate the Christian Indians and build their town in orderly fashion but they did not succeed, even though they had laid it out. When they have lived long in one place, it at last becomes troublesome to secure wood for fuel because all the wood in the neighborhood has been used. This causes them to leave the place and plan a new village for the sake of the wood and other conveniences. Although they have horses that roam about and are rarely used except when they wish to ride, it is too troublesome for them to break these to work and, furthermore, since fetching wood is the work of the women, the men do not concern themselves about it.

Of inheritances they know nothing. Every Indian knows that whatever he leaves at his death is divided among his friends. If a woman becomes a widow, no matter how long she may have lived with her husband, friends come, take everything that be-

3:Zeisberger M-5 (1767-1780)1910
NM7 Delaware NM7

428 longed to the man, and bring it to one place. The friends do not keep a single article, for they wish to forget the dead and are afraid lest the smallest part of the property of the deceased should remind them of him. They give what the deceased has left to their friends and no one of his friends receives anything; even though he should wish to take something he will not do it through fear of the others. If a dying Indian leaves his gun or any other trifle to a particular friend the legatee is immediately put in possession and no one disputes his right. The widow gets nothing, yet whatever the husband has given to his wife during his life-time remains her property. Therefore we need not wonder that a married Indian pair should not have their goods in common, for otherwise the wife would be left wholly destitute after her husband's death. In like manner the husband inherits nothing when his wife dies.

768 587 According to ancient custom a widow should not marry again within a year after the death of her husband, for the Indians say that he does not forsake her before that time. At the end of this period, however, they believe that his soul goes to its place. A widow must endeavor to live by her own industry. She is not permitted to purchase any meat, for the Indians are superstitiously persuaded that their guns fail if a widow should eat of the game they have killed. Now and then a kind friend will venture to transgress the rule and give her some meat secretly. As soon as the first year of her widowhood is passed, the friends of the deceased husband clothe and provide for her and her children. They also propose another husband if they know of a desirable party, or, at least, tell her that she is now at liberty to choose for herself. If, however, she has not attended to the prescribed rule but married within the year, they never trouble themselves about her again except, perhaps, to speak evil of her.

626

If a man's wife die, her relatives pretend to have some claim upon him until a year has passed. If he has remained a widower during that time they generally secure him a wife, preferring a sister of the departed, if one be living.

764 The burying places are at some distance from the towns. Before they had hatchets and other tools they used to line the

3:Zeisberger M-5 (1767-1780)1910
NM7 Delaware NM7

622 are moved neither by fear of men nor of God; fortunately there are few such.

[273] Strong drink occasions much disorder in the Indian towns.[266] If a chief is himself an abstainer, he may accomplish much against this evil, but he must be ever watchful and not tire in his efforts.

[428] At the death of a chief neither his children, wife, nor relatives inherit his possessions. Everything is distributed among the people except the wampum and belts, which belong to the chief in his official capacity, and the Council Bag. These are preserved and turned over to his successor in office. In general, some person who lived in intimacy with the deceased chief, and is well acquainted with the affairs of state is chosen to be his successor. It is generally agreed that such and such an one is the right person to assume the dignity of chief. If he is discreet and wins the favor of the captains and the people, the former in particular, will support him in every possible 624 way. A captain, such as White Eye[267] was, is the Chief's right hand. He must undertake everything ordered of him by the chief, even at the hazard of his life. To show fear would not be in harmony with his dignity and a disgrace. If he is wounded or killed by the enemy, the whole nation joins in avenging his death, taking injury done him as seriously as if it concerned the person of the chief. This the captains are aware of and it gives them courage.

728 A captain has no more right to conclude peace than a chief to begin war.[268] If peace is offered to a captain, when he is in the enemy's country, he can give no other answer than that he will bring the proposal to the notice of the chief, for as a warrior he cannot make peace, and that in due time reply will be given. If the chief inclines to peace, he, as it were, assumes his office again, exerts his power, takes the matter out of the hands of the captain and desires him to sit down, which signifies declaring a truce. The hatchet is taken out of the captain's hand and he is obliged to cease from hostilities and keep his men quiet. The chief knowing that inactivity is not agreeable to the captain, asks his assistance in the negotiations and generally chooses him to be the messenger of peace to the

8: Lindeström T-5 (1654-1655) 1925
NM7 Delaware NM7

CHAPTER X.

Concerning the Marriage of the American People and the Treatment [Used] by the Savage Females Against Birth Pangs.

These Indians are a bestial people and have their intercourse together with father, mother, brother and sister like irrational brutes, no one knowing rightly who is the father of the child;[1] but their sachem or chief he must take a wife to himself, not because he intends to conceive children with her alone, but because his government and household exists as under a family,[2] about which we shall obtain further [details] hereafter. This his wife, she must manage his entire household like a matron who always, in the absence of the sachem, must guard his property, which becomes her possession after his death.

When she has thus been wooed by him, the bride must bedeck [herself] for a year and a day,[3] although they do not know what a year means, yet

[1] Lindeström's religious zeal led him astray; besides he did not understand the family life of the Indians. Some early writers state that Indians of this district had but one wife, except the chiefs, who had many. Their ideas of morality were of course different from those of the white settlers. De Vries tells us that an Indian would lend his wife to a friend, and that jealousy did not exist among them.

[2] *Hans undherhafwande Regiment och Hwshåldningh bestådr lijka som undher een familia.* In other words, according to Lindeström, the government is patriarchal, the chief being like the father of a household, hence it is necessary to have a mother of the household. Cf. in this connection a summary on "The Chief of the Indian Clan," by Rudolf Elander (Gothenburg, 1909).

[3] "A year and a day," see above, *Dedication*, note 23.